
From: Barr, James (FTA)
To: Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
CC: Ossi, Joseph (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Carranza, Edward (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA); Ryan, James (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Sent: 8/27/2009 3:26:23 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu Rail Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

Thanks, Ted.

By the way, HRT still proposes a direct use of the Dillingham Building with the touchdown in the adjacent urban refuge. I would like the Region's support on my proposal to move the station further east to the Alakea Street location. This is a reasonable alternative that avoids the direct use of an NRHP structure, maintains the urban refuge and reduces the impact to constructive use. But, as HRT would have it, there are no constructive use impacts on any resources caused by the project – who knew! Also, the AFEIS 4(f) evaluation reveals that while HRT proposes various design measures to minimize harm, there are no mitigation measures proposed for any of the project's direct use impacts. Mitigation is left to the PA. This gives us substantial leeway to enforce reasonable mitigation measures.

Thanks;
Jim

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2009 4:47 PM
To: Barr, James (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Subject: FW: Honolulu Rail Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

Jim, the meeting will be next Wednesday, the time TBD, probably about 10-10:30 Hawaii time. We'll know today.

Attached are the materials they would submit. I am going to draft a short statement from FTA along the lines of what you, Joe and I spoke about on the outstanding mitigation issues urging the parties to focus on identifiable impacts to identifiable resources and directed mitigation to those impacts, and to avoid unspecific impacts and open ended and unfocused mitigation proposals. Hopefully that last piece of information can help the process move along, as the parties (including ACHP) were asking for FTA to weight in with their perspective on the outstanding mitigation issues.

They have changed the status of Honolulu in the signature lines at the end. ACHP also made this comment. However I don't think that is the last word on this from Honolulu.

Ted

From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2009 9:36 PM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Cc: Foell, Stephanie; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Hogan, Steven; aranda@infraconsultllc.com; Souki, Jesse K.
Subject: Honolulu Rail Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

Hi Ted –

We polled the signatory/consulting parties for their availability over the next two weeks. We received responses from the following:

ACHP (Blythe)
NPS (Elaine)
AIA (Spencer and Jeff)
Historic Hawaii (Kiersten)
Oahu Island Burial Council (Hina)
Koolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club (Mahealani)
National Trust for Historic Preservation (Betsy)
Prince Kuhio Hawaiian Civic Club (Chasmin)

Wednesday, September 2nd is the best day.

I have not heard from the SHPD and Navy. Will follow-up by phone tomorrow.

We would also like to set the next meeting for the following Wednesday.

Earlier you had related that you would be preparing a paper that states FTA's position regarding the PA stipulations. Would this be available to send to the signatories/consulting parties soon?

I have attached the latest PA, which responds to the comments from the ACHP shown in a matrix, and a listing of those previously proposed stipulations and their disposition. Also attached is a short paper written to document the steps that the project has taken to avoid and minimize impacts on historic resources. Please let me know if these documents should be sent to the parties with the meeting notice.

Faith Miyamoto
Department of Transportation Services
City & County of Honolulu
(808) 768-8350
fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov